

REMARKS

In the foregoing claim amendments, claim 7 has been amended. Now pending in the application are claims 1-24, of which claims 1, 7, 13 and 20 are independent. The following comments address all stated grounds for rejection and place the presently pending claims, as identified above, in condition for allowance.

Claim Amendments

Applicant has amended claim 7 to clarify the scope of the claimed invention. In particular, claim 7 has been amended to recite that the graphical user interface displays a question, a plurality of answer selections and a plurality of answer regions to a user to allow the user to drag each answer selection of the plurality of answer selections to a unique answer region of the plurality of answer regions. Support for the claim amendments can be found in other claims including claim 1. No new matter is added.

Drawings

The Examiner notes that new corrected drawings are required because Figures 1-8 are informal. In response to the Office Action, Applicant submits formal drawings for the pending application.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1, 7 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,347,943 to Fields *et al.* ("Fields"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method including the steps of providing an interactive image-drag-drop software tool and forwarding the image-drag-drop software tool to a remote client. The software tool generates a *graphical user interface displaying a question, a plurality of answer selections and a plurality of answer regions* to a user to allow the user to drag each answer selection of the plurality of answer selections to a unique answer region of the plurality of answer regions. Claim 7 recites similar limitations. Claim 13 is a medium claim that parallels claim 1.

Fields discloses the creation of an individualized course of instruction for each user.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited reference fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1, 7 and 13. Applicant submits that Fields does not disclose an interactive image-drag-drop software tool that generates a *graphical user interface displaying a question, a plurality of answer selections and a plurality of answer regions* to a user to allow the user to drag each answer selection of the plurality of answer selections to a unique answer region of the plurality of answer regions, as recited claims 1, 7, 10 and 21. In the claimed invention, the interactive image-drag-drop software tool generates a *graphical user interface displaying a question, a plurality of answer selections and a plurality of answer regions*. The user can drag each answer selection of the plurality of answer selections to a unique answer region of the plurality of answer regions.

In comparison, Fields discloses selecting a page type from templates. (See, step 57 in Fig. 4 of Fields). Fields also discloses that the templates can include multiple types, such as multiple choice, drag and drop, fill in the blank, drop down list and ranking. Fields just discloses that drag and drop can be provided as one of selections for the templates. Field, however, is silent about the content of the drag and drop template. In particular, Fields does not disclose that the drag and drop template includes *a question, a plurality of answer selections and a plurality of answer regions*, as recited in claims 1, 7 and 13.

In light of the aforementioned claim amendments and arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that Fields fails to disclose each and every element of claims 1, 7 and 13. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 1, 7 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), and pass the claims to allowance.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Fields in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,435,880 to Tsumori *et al.* ("Tsumori"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for the following reasons.

Claims 2-6, 8-12 and 13-19 depend on claims 1, 7 and 13, respectively. Claim 20 is a device claim that includes similar limitations to claims 1, 7 and 13. Claims 21-24 depend upon claim 20.

Tsumori relates to a learning-support device and method that provides answer-selectable questions and explanations corresponding to the user's answer.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 7, 13 and 20. Applicant submits that Fields and Tsumori do not teach or suggest an interactive image-drag-drop software tool that generates a *graphical user interface displaying a question, a plurality of answer selections and a plurality of answer regions* to a user to allow the user to drag each answer selection of the plurality of answer selections to a unique answer region of the plurality of answer regions, as recited claims 1, 7, 13 and 20.

Tsumori is cited by the Examiner to provide teachings for the limitations added in claims 2-6, 8-12, 13-19 and 21-24. Applicant submits that Tsumori does not teach or suggest the interactive image-drag-drop software tool generates a *graphical user interface displaying a question, a plurality of answer selections and a plurality of answer regions*, as recited claims 1, 7, 13 and 20. Tsumori is silent about a drag drop software tool.

In light of the aforementioned arguments, Applicant respectfully submits that Fields and Tsumori fail to teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1, 7, 13 and 20. Claims 2-6, 8-12, 13-19 and 21-24, which depend on claims 1, 7, 13 and 20, respectively, are not deemed obvious over the cited references. Applicant therefore requests the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 2-6, 8-12 and 14-24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), and pass the claims to allowance.

Application No.: 09/823,610
Art Unit: 2173

Docket No.: SMQ-057 (P5708)

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue. If, however, the Examiner considers that further obstacles to allowance of these claims persist, we invite a telephone call to Applicant's representative.

Dated: August 24, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Anthony A. Laurentano
Registration No. 58,220
LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP
28 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 227-7400
(617) 742-4214 (Fax)
Attorney for Applicant